

make a lot of innocent people pay the price.

So my hope is that tomorrow there is no more Government shutdown; that tomorrow we look forward to substantive negotiations in good faith, honest debate, not hate, with civility, trying to reach an agreement. These are big decisions we are going to make that are going to affect our country going into the next century. We ought to do it thoughtfully, carefully, and if we can reach an agreement in January, great, and if we cannot reach an agreement, then maybe, in fact, the differences are irreconcilable. Then the people of the country can make the decision. That is the way it is supposed to be in a democracy.

Happy Hanukkah, Merry Christmas. I hope we soon get home to be with our loved ones. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I see on the floor the esteemed senior Senator from Rhode Island. I will be happy to yield to my senior colleague if he wishes to speak. I am going to take 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. PELL. I thank my friend very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

THE BUDGET IMPASSE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I do not believe there is justification for the partial shutdown of the Federal Government. It is really occurring only because of a widely perceived and grossly exaggerated assumption that the long-term Federal budget must be concluded in the same timeframe as the annual appropriations bills.

There is no real basis for a linkage between the two beyond the budget for the current fiscal year. The fact that there is an assumption of linkage beyond that point is, at best, an artful strategy or, at worst, a hoax on the public and on our democratic Government. Appropriations and reconciliation are two completely different processes.

On the one hand, it is notable that significant agreement already has been reached on a great many major reductions in Government expenditures in the 13 major appropriations bills that have been or are being processed. But they are all badly behind schedule, through no fault of our President, and six of them are heavily burdened by extraneous provisions dealing with matters like striker replacement and the abortion issue—matters that should be addressed in separate legislation on their own merits. And now the passage of interim spending authority has been arbitrarily made a condition of budget reconciliation.

But the reconciliation process is an entirely separate matter. Unlike the appropriations process, the failure of which leads to a cutoff of current funding, the reconciliation process is not driven by immediate need. Absent passage of a reconciliation bill, current

law stands. The Government continues to operate at existing levels until reasonable agreement can be reached about changed priorities and a new level of commitment.

That the two processes were declared to be compressed into the same timeframe is simply a transparent device to force acceptance of policy choices that are not in accord with the priorities of the American people or the President.

The second continuing resolution passed in November tightened the time frame by specifying that a 7-year balanced budget plan should be enacted in the first session of this Congress, which presumably ends January 2. But the remaining period of 2 weeks includes the traditional holiday season and it seems to me that any comprehensive solution forced this week would inevitably be flawed by haste.

Mr. President, the time for budgetary hostage-taking is over. The country will not stand for it and both parties put themselves at risk of public rejection because of what appears to be petty and small-minded squabbling.

As I see it, the solution must come in two separate steps:

First, the appropriations process must be concluded without any further delay. All remaining bills should be sent to the President forthwith in whatever form a majority can approve. Vetoed bills should be returned promptly so that revised versions can be enacted. A realistic continuing resolution should be passed providing funding authority at least until January 12 to allow for the process of revising and repassing vetoed legislation.

Second, separately, the terms of the second continuing resolution must be modified to provide for an expanded time frame for reconciliation extending into the second session. The President is entitled to adequate opportunity to secure the best budget he can obtain that will reflect his highest priorities, while still honoring those of the congressional majority. As a practical matter, it will be necessary to reach closure on at least the first stages of a long range budget by the statutory date for presentation of the fiscal year 1997 budget by the first Monday in February.

Mr. President, I offer these views from a vantage point of some detachment. I have not endorsed the idea of a balanced budget and I do not subscribe to the mantra that it should be achieved in the arbitrary timeframe of 7 years.

I do believe we should curb deficit spending, and that includes borrowing to pay for a tax cut. And I do not believe the agenda of the United States should be set by a willful subgroup of the House majority.

Clearly, we all are going to have to give ground. We in the minority, for example, must acknowledge more candidly the need for constraints on the Federal medical programs. The majority must relent their drive to curtail great advances we have made in social

legislation, particularly education. And both sides, I believe, must acknowledge the patent futility of cutting taxes at the very time we seek to curtail deficits.

Tax cuts must be deferred for the present, even if it means a delay in more favorable treatment for capital gains, and I support more favorable treatment for capital gains.

I think the image that the country has of us is that of children squabbling. I hope the sooner we can get down to business and reach a compromise, the better off we are. Plus the Government only moves when there is compromise. And in this case we are denying it the opportunity to work.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The Senator from Nevada.

THE BUDGET IMPASSE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was asked by our floor leader, Senator DORGAN, to come to the floor and offer my views on what is going on with the impasse now facing us.

First, I think it is important to recognize how well the country is doing. We tend to hear so much negativism about our country. The fact of the matter is that our country is doing remarkably well economically. Why do I say that? We have had the lowest inflation and unemployment in some 40 years. Mr. President, we have had corporate profits that have never been higher. They have sometimes been as high, but never higher. We have economic growth that is as good as it has been since the days of John Kennedy. The stock market has been going up significantly. There have been some people crying out that it went down today. Well, there have been adjustments coming. Any stock forecaster would tell you that there would be adjustments. It happens toward the end of the year every year. With this remarkable climb we have had in the stock market, it is not unexpected.

I also say, Mr. President, that we have heard a lot in years gone by about Government being too big. I think those of us in this Chamber would acknowledge that Government has gotten too big. But what has happened in the last 2½ years? We have 175,000 fewer Federal employees today than we had 2½ years ago, excluding the military. I think that is pretty good. I think it speaks well of what has happened in this Government and in this country in the last several years. Now, we have not done enough, but let us talk about the good things that are happening in the country.

This economy is on fire. It is doing great. What about the so-called CR, the continuing resolution? It is something the American public hears all the time. Why are we talking about a CR, a continuing resolution? We are talking about a continuing resolution because, each year, by the first of October, we

have 13 appropriations bills we are supposed to pass. It takes 13 appropriations bills to allow our Government to function during the year. We have a yearly appropriation for those 13 different subcommittees. Well, this year, we did not do our work. I say, respectfully, that it is the Republican leadership in the House and the Senate that has not allowed the bills to pass.

The last time we had a Government shutdown, 26 days ago, 850,000 people were out of work. We were able to pass, since then, a number of bills, especially the Defense appropriations bill. As a result of that, we have approximately 500,000 fewer employees that are subject to being furloughed now than we did then. I wish the 250,000 did not have to be, and they should not be. But it is the result of the appropriations bills not passing. It has nothing to do with a balanced budget. It has nothing to do with increased taxes or lower taxes. It has to do with the fact that this body and the other body—the House and the Senate—have not done their work. We are at this budget impasse now as a result of the appropriations bills not having been passed.

Much of the rhetoric, Mr. President, has focused on who gets what and why do they get it? I think we need to look at what Kevin Phillips said, who is a Republican political analyst. He said a number of things, but about 6 weeks ago, he said this, and it was at the time this budget fiasco was very heated:

Spending on Government programs, from Medicare and education to home heating oil assistance, is to be reduced in ways that principally burden the poor and the middle class, while simultaneously taxes are to be cut in ways that predominantly benefit the top one or two percent of Americans.

This is not something that some wild-eyed liberal Democrat said. This is not something any Democrat said. This is a Republican, who is noted in Washington for being hard on Democrats when necessary, and hard on Republicans when he feels it is appropriate. With this budget battle that is going on, he feels it is appropriate to lay the cards out where they exist. Who benefits from the budget proposal the Republicans have given us? The top 1 or 2 percent of Americans. Who is burdened? The middle class and the poor.

Much of the rhetoric, as I have indicated in the debate over the budget, has focused on numbers: OMB versus CBO. What I would like to talk tonight about is not Medicaid, even though there is certainly room to talk about that. I am not going to talk about education and how my senior colleague, who just left the room, has done as much as any person who ever served in the Legislature on a national basis to direct attention to education, or how the programs the Republican leadership have given us affects education negatively. I am not going to talk about that at any length tonight. I am going to talk, Mr. President, about Medicare and how important Medicare is.

The budget we have been given from the Republican leadership says they want to cut \$270 billion. That is the bill the President vetoed—\$270 billion in Medicare cuts. I think it is interesting to note—and I do not think it is coincidental—that we have \$270 billion in Medicare cuts and \$245 billion approximately in tax cuts. Who do those tax cuts benefit? The top 1 or 2 percent of Americans. We need to eliminate the deficit. There is no question about that. We need to eliminate the deficits and, I think, do something about the debt, the \$5 trillion that has accumulated. I do not think we can rest on our laurels, that there has been general agreement to balance the budget in 7 years because, by then, we will have another \$1.5 trillion in debt that we are going to have to pass on to my grandchildren and their children. I hope, Mr. President, that we will be concerned about not the deficit—as we should be—but how about being concerned about the debt, the \$5 trillion that we owe?

It is easy to debate these numbers, the deficit, which we continually talk about, and ignore the debt. I would rather, instead of having \$245 billion in tax cuts, which help the top 1 or 2 percent of Americans, we take that money and apply it toward the debt, the accumulated \$5 trillion. That would make a significant dent in the debt—\$245 billion.

What is often missing from the debate when we talk about all these numbers, Mr. President, is the policy argument. What are the policy ramifications of what each side is attempting to do? Will the decisions we reach today affect all Americans tomorrow? If so, in what way will these decisions be felt by the American public? It is this often unspoken question we fail to communicate in our efforts to assemble a balanced budget plan.

Both sides are in agreement about achieving a balanced budget. You cannot debate that now. There are very few who say we should not have a balanced budget. The vast majority of Democrats and Republicans agree on a balanced budget. They have agreed on a time certain—a date. Great strides have been made in that regard.

The budget debate really centers on the priorities that matter in getting the budget to a balance. Again, Mr. President, I was unable to put this on a chart, but Kevin Phillips, on public radio, on the 14th said:

The Republicans in Congress are back with a foolproof guaranteed deficit elimination scheme in which the deficit will shrink from roughly \$200 billion in 1996 to nothing, zero, in 2002. The other zero in this equation, I am sorry to say, is the IQ of anybody who believes it. Since the Republicans started producing deficit elimination charts in the early 1980's, their three real goals have been very different. The first has been to cut taxes for the constituencies and avoid new taxes; the second has been to shrink the role of government and the safety net; and the third has been to help the stock and bond markets.

These parts, at least, have worked. The tax rates have come down. The rich have gotten richer and the Dow Jones Industrial Average jumped from under 1,000 to over 5,000. Deficit reduction isn't the real goal. Most of the time it has been a slogan for one of the biggest economic con games of the late 20th century United States.

I repeat, "Deficit reduction isn't the real goal. Most of the time it has been a slogan for one of the biggest economic con games of the late 20th century United States."

So we will talk a little bit about policy here tonight. We will talk about how we need to be concerned about Medicare. I can defend Medicare. The first elected job I had was to represent the then largest hospital board in Nevada, Clark County, where Las Vegas is located.

During the time I served on the hospital board, Medicare came into being. The first period of time I served on the hospital board, when somebody came to that county institution and they were brought by their son or their daughter or their husband or their wife or a neighbor, they had to sign that they would be responsible for that hospital and doctor bill. When you brought your mother or your father or your husband or your wife to that hospital and you did not pay, we had a collection department that went out after you and sued you. You brought your sick mother or father or husband or wife to that hospital, you paid.

Prior to 1960, less than 40 percent of the American public, of senior citizens, had any kind of health insurance. Now, 99 percent of senior citizens have health insurance. We made great strides during that period of time.

I feel the program called Medicare should be defended. I know it has some warts on it that we need to have a cosmetologist take care of. I am willing to do that. I know thousands and thousands of Nevadans who rely almost exclusively on this program as a means of living.

Mr. President, 30 years ago when I served on the hospital board and I had just left back here—I worked as a Capitol policeman, went to law school back here—when I left here, almost as soon as I left, Congress passed Medicare. The Democrats passed it. The Republicans, Mr. President, opposed it. They opposed its creation 30 years ago.

The idea was simple: Create a program for senior citizens to have quality medical care while ensuring that seniors have financial stability through their retiring years. Very simple idea, not very complex. We needed a program that would allow seniors to have good medical care. It sought to avoid the situation where if you brought in somebody and they could not pay then, you sued them. That is not appropriate.

Yet the fervor with which this simple idea was opposed by certain people was significant, some say unprecedented. It is because of the majority party's historic opposition to Medicare that many in this country today are skeptical of

their efforts now to say, "We want to reform the program." If I have heard it once I heard it a hundred times, my friends on the other side of the aisle saying, "We are not cutting Medicare; we are only cutting the rate of growth of Medicare."

What they fail to acknowledge is that we have an aging population. Significant numbers of new people come on Medicare every day, and in addition to having an aging population we have rapidly increased health care costs.

Now, we have a health care crisis in this country today. No question about it. We had it last year. We tried to do something about it last year. We were stopped from doing it principally by the health insurance industry, but we were stopped from doing it.

Now we have people saying we have a health care crisis. I acknowledge that. Remember last year when we talked about managed care and people walked in here from the other side of the aisle saying managed care takes away choice. Well, I think some of the suggestions from my friends on the other side of the aisle about doing managed care with Medicare is a good idea. It was a good idea last year and is a good idea this year. I think we cannot have the sole burden of reducing health care costs on the backs of senior citizens.

I ask rhetorically to my friends on the other side, if you were so opposed to Medicare then, why should the American public believe you are interested in saving it now? If you look at some of the rhetoric, it makes a person wonder. Just last October—that is just a few weeks ago—the Speaker of the House of Representatives, NEWT GINGRICH, was quoted as saying:

Now let me talk about Medicare. We don't get rid of it in round one because we don't think that would be politically smart and we don't think that's the right way to go through a transition, but we believe it's going to wither on the vine because we think people will leave it voluntarily.

The 24th day of October, 1995, is when he said that.

Now, I ask my peers, who is not bargaining in good faith? People who think that Medicare is going to wither on the vine?

I think Medicare is worth defending. I think it should be worth defending for lots of people, because it works. Look at the differences between 1964 and 1965 and now and you will reach the same conclusion. In 1965, it is taken as a given that elderly are more financially secure. They live longer and enjoy greater access to health care in their golden years. This is not because of tax breaks they earned during their lifetimes or because of market forces. Rather, it is attributable to the successful programs such as Medicare that we have passed in this and the other body. Since its inception about 30 years ago, Medicare has extended the life expectancy of senior citizens and improved their quality of life.

Remember, all we want to do with Medicare is allow senior citizens to

have health care available to them, but quality health care and at a cost that would not devastate them. Since its inception Medicare has both extended the life expectancies of seniors and improved their quality of life. I will debate that with anyone, any time.

What about the specifics? Because of Medicare, and Medicare principally, we have made significant advances on cataract removal. We can all remember years ago when someone had cataract surgery, they were hospitalized. It was serious surgery. Now they do it in outpatient. Why? Because of Medicare. They have done so many cataract surgeries now they have it down to a very specific science, and they do it quickly. They do it with implants and all kinds of things that would not have been thought of 10 or 20 years ago. Joint replacement, cardiac bypass, heart surgery, these are some of the advances made principally because of Medicare. Because of the funding of Medicare, seniors do not have to break the bank to pay for these procedures.

In 1965, 28½ percent of senior citizens lived below the poverty line. In 1995, just less than half that, 12.9 percent live below the poverty line.

We must in this country be doing something right. Why do we have all the doomsayers, all the people talking about how bad we are? The economy is doing well. Seniors are not as much in poverty as they used to be. Does this mean that Medicare is untouchable? Of course, not. We need to address the problems in a responsible manner. But let us address them keeping in mind this truth. This Federal initiative—Medicare was a Federal initiative—is accomplishing the simple goal it was designed to achieve, improving the lives of old people in America, of senior citizens in America.

It is true that Medicare costs more today than it did in 1965. But it is true of all health insurance. Mr. President, maybe we in this world of political correctness develop terms of art that do not focus on the problem. My grandmother lived alone. Her husband died, my grandfather who I never knew. But I knew my grandmother. She was so proud of the fact that she got an old age pension check every month—that is what she called it, "old age pension check"—because it gave her dignity and independence.

That is why seniors are better off than they used to be—because they have the ability to be independent and have dignity through Medicare, through the Social Security check that my grandmother referred to as an "old age pension check." Those kinds of things have made it better for people who are in their golden years in America today.

Medicare costs more today than it did in 1965. I repeat that is true of all health insurance. Increasing knowledge of diseases and causes, and the technological advances have transformed the care that all insurers provide. Health care today is much more effective and,

of course, more expensive. I acknowledge that. Health care today is a very technical procedure that affects all Americans. I remind everyone that privatization is something we need to look to. But Medicare costs have not increased as much as health care costs in the private sector.

So those that push privatization—which we all do—should understand that Medicare costs are behind the costs of medicine in the private sector.

I do not see how you can say that taking an arbitrary figure like \$270 billion is going to protect the Medicare from bankruptcy.

I have also heard so many times that trustees say if we do not put some more money into Medicare it is going to go broke. Twenty-five out of 27 years Medicare has been in existence they have said the same thing. Medicare is a program that has been a pay-as-you-go program. Of course, the trustees have acknowledged the fact that we have to figure out better ways to fund and figure out ways to cut expenses in Medicare. But to have the statement made on and on and continually and over and over that the trustees say it is going to go broke as if it is some new revelation—they have been saying this from the very beginning, and what do we do? We fix it every time as we will this time.

We also hear a lot, Mr. President, that \$270 billion is going to protect it. It is not. That is an arbitrary figure, in my opinion made only to take care of the tax breaks for the 1 or 2 percent of Americans who will get most of the benefit. About two-thirds of the projected savings would come from reduced payments to hospitals, nursing homes, and physicians without any basic change in the system responsible for rising costs.

That does not sound to me that we are reforming Medicare and strengthening Medicare. This does not sound like reform. It sounds like, if anything, that it would improve the delivery of health care for the elderly; that is, cut payments to hospitals, nursing homes, and physicians without any basic change in the system. Indeed, the policy ramifications of this proposal might well undermine the quality of services, threaten the economic stability of providers, and reduce the availability of services.

Another 20 to 25 percent of the proposed savings to the Government from the program which the President vetoed would come from increased payments by beneficiaries. Having beneficiaries pay more can hardly be called a strengthening of Medicare. This is particularly true since average out-of-pocket costs for beneficiaries have been steadily rising, and would grow even more with this plan. It is important to read beyond the rhetoric, over the numbers, and beyond the smoke and mirrors. The proposal that was vetoed by the President had real life consequences for lots of people.

So, Mr. President, when we hear a lot of rhetoric about returning to the good

old days, I am not sure senior citizens want a return to the good old days. I think they are happier with Medicare, and with a Social Security check coming in on a monthly basis. Remember: The Social Security checks they get are not welfare. That is money that is paid into a fund by employers and employees.

So I suggest that we have experienced a lot of good since the creation of some of these programs, and since they were initially debated. By most measures, the United States in 1995 is a dramatically better place to live than it was in 1965 if you are a senior citizen.

Of course, we have to do something about the crime that ravages senior citizens—violent crime, crimes involving telemarketing, and other things like that. We have to do a better job there. But as far as economic safety, security, 1995 for senior citizens is much better than 1965. The economy is more than twice as large in terms of real dollar. Poverty has declined in the senior population despite a larger population.

There are other good things that have happened. Twenty-five years ago the Cuyahoga River caught fire. A river in Ohio started burning. It was then determined that maybe we should do something about cleaning up our rivers and streams. The Clean Water Act was passed 25 years ago. What do we have now? We have greatly improved water. At the time the Cuyahoga River caught fire about 80 percent of the rivers and streams in this country were polluted. Now those figures have almost reversed. We do not have 80 percent of our rivers and streams polluted now. We have a little over 20 percent. We have made dramatic strides in clean water.

Clean air—even though we have millions of more cars on the road today than we had 25 years ago, because of the Clean Air Act our air is cleaner than it was 25 years ago. Scientific advances have allowed us to do that. Most people are healthier, living longer, and most jobs are less dangerous. Most discrimination has ended, especially formal discrimination. Education levels are at an all-time high even though our education system needs a lot more work done on it. I acknowledge that. But, Mr. President, out of the 141 top universities in the world, the United States has 129 out of 141. Our higher education is not touched by any other country. We need a lot of work with our elementary and secondary schools. Of course, we do. That is why we need to be putting more money in instead of less.

Personal freedom has been improved in modern-day America more than it was in the past. In fact, personal freedom has never been greater than it is today. Once reserved for the very rich, air travel have become commonplace.

I believe we are overlooking the reasons why the final decision of balancing the budget has to be thought

out and thought out well. There are programs and laws that improve lives, and they are worthy of defending as a matter of principle. It is not just about policy and numbers. It is about people. That is what this debate is about. The decisions we reach in the next few days, the next few weeks, and the next few months will have lasting consequence on all of us.

I close by referring to a Republican who said, "Spending on government programs, from Medicare and education, to home heating oil assistance, is to be reduced in ways that is principally a burden to the poor and the middle class—"talking about the bill the President vetoed"—while simultaneously taxes are to be cut in ways that predominantly benefit the top one or two percent of Americans."

So I say to those within the sound of my voice, the debate, Mr. President, is a debate on the difference between right and wrong. We feel we are on the right side of the issue and that we have to stand up for principle.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MACK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING SENATOR NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM

Mr. DODD. Madam President, expectations and reality are rarely one and the same. So when our colleague from the State of Kansas, Senator KASSEBAUM, says she never expected to be here in the U.S. Senate, it is not surprising that this is where she ended up. But very true to all expectations, Madam President, Senator KASSEBAUM has distinguished herself as one of this institution's best and brightest. So it is with reluctance that I rise to bid farewell to my dear friend and respected colleague.

Senator KASSEBAUM has graced the Halls of the U.S. Senate every single day of the almost 18 years she has spent here. Never partisan and always fair, her leadership of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources is exemplary, and it is a joy to serve with her on that body as well as on the Committee on Foreign Relations. Indeed, she has helped to keep the Senate's spirit of civility alive.

A leader, independent thinker, and mediator, Senator KASSEBAUM's record of accomplishment is lengthy and impressive. Aside from being the first female chair of a major committee in 40 years, she has managed to write a health insurance reform bill that has drawn Labor and Human Resources Committee consensus around this difficult and often controversial issue. She has been indispensable in reauthorizing the Ryan White Care Act, a program of great importance to the State of Connecticut, and has been a valuable supporter of the Head Start Program.

But Senator KASSEBAUM's accomplishments have improved the lives of those well beyond United States shores. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, she was invaluable in facilitating Central American peace initiatives and in finding political solutions to the conflict in El Salvador. And as chairwoman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs, she fought to bring an end to South African apartheid by supporting sanctions against that nation; she then facilitated their repeal upon the election of President Nelson Mandela.

And at home in Kansas, Madam President, Senator KASSEBAUM's constituents love her just as much as her Senate colleagues. Her overwhelming support at the polls—76 percent in 1984, and 74 percent in 1990—reflects Kansans' deep appreciation of her commitment to them. She has never wavered from the value her father instilled in her: that her roots were always in Kansas.

Madam President, both Senator KASSEBAUM and I are the children of public servants whose interest in politics and government service was nourished throughout our childhoods. To walk alongside Senator KASSEBAUM as both of us follow in our fathers' footsteps has fostered a special bond between us. We have served together on two committees, and have worked as trusted partners on many important issues. And I realize how fulfilling it must be for her, as she leaves this body, to know that she has made her father proud.

Senator KASSEBAUM is a noble servant of Kansans and all Americans, a cherished friend, and a beloved colleague whom I greatly admire. I will be sorry to see her leave the Senate, but I am confident that her spirit will endure. I wish her the very best as she approaches her retirement, and look forward to serving this last year with her.

TRIBUTE TO A MAN OF GREAT CONSCIENCE, RETIRING SENATOR MARK HATFIELD

Mr. DODD. Madam President, Senator HATFIELD's recent announcement that he would be leaving the U.S. Senate left me disappointed, for his departure from this body will mean the loss of yet another of the Senate's most honorable Members. For five terms,